



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

come the modern Bavarian *der fark*. It is also barely possible that M.H.G. *varc*, *varkes* was for an original *varc*, *\*vargēs*, I.E. *\*porkós*. At any rate it will be seen that considerable confusion has crept into this word.

In like manner *schnörkel* for *\*schnerchel* < *snarha* may have been influenced by a L.G. *\*snerken* < *\*snerhken*. Perhaps Bav. *schnurkeln* (see Benecke, Müller u. Zarncke, *Mhd. Wtb.* s. v. *snirche*) points to such a form. It is apparent, therefore, that *schnörkel* is derivable from *snarha* without doing violence to Grimm's law. It would then be connected with the large family of words from the I.E. root *snō*, *snē*. Cf. Kluge, *Et. Wtb.*, s. v. *schnur*, and Noreen, *Urg. Lautlehre*, pp. 77 and 208.

The confusion of *ch* and *k* in *ferchel*: *ferkel*, *schnörchel*: *schnörkel* may have been further promoted by the interchange of *ch* and *k* in other words in which *ch* and *k* both come from Germanic *k*. This was brought about by the development of a vowel in the combination *-rk*. Thus O.H.G. *starc* and *starah*, *storc* and *stora*, *werk* and *werah*, etc., giving M.H.G. *starc* and *starch*, *storc* and *storch*, *werc* and *werch*, and N.H.G. *stark*, *storch*, *werk*. Where *ch* occurs, the svarabhaktic vowel was present before the High German soundshifting.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

Chicago.

#### NOTE ON ALFRED'S *Cura Pastoralis*.

IN Alfred's version of Gregory's preface to the *Cura* there is an inserted phrase, *ond hira ȝeðæf bion*, which seems to have puzzled the commentators and lexicographers, all of whom see in the adjective *ȝeðæf* only the sense of 'satisfied,' 'approving,' which is exactly the reverse of the sense required by the connection in this place. Sweet translates 'and subdue them,' but says in a note that this is purely conjectural, and gives the suggestions of Skeat and Lumby, the former of whom proposes 'be their help, that is, their amender or corrector,' and the latter, (comparing "*ic eom ȝepafa*" in the *Boetius*), 'be convinced of them.'

It seems a little strange that the passage in the *Boetius* did not suggest the meaning, for '*ic eom ȝepafa*,' cited by Lumby, translates

*fateor*. The phrase in the *Cura*, without question, has the same meaning, and we may translate: 'The fourth is that he should be willing to recognize his own faults and to acknowledge them.'

The phrase *ȝepafa beon* occurs often in the *Boetius*, and a comparison will show the meaning clearly. Instances are xxvi, 2, *ac hwi ne eart þu his ȝepafa?* (Lat. *quidni fateare?*); xxxiv, 12, *we sceolon beon nede ȝepafan: ibid. ðæs þu wære nu ȝepafa*; xxxiv, 2, *ic eom ȝepafa*, (Lat. *accipio*, cf. Hor. *Sat.* i, v, 58); xxxiv, 3, *ic his wæs ær ȝepafa*; xxxiv, 9, *ic eom ȝepafa*, (Lat. *assentior*). In all these Fox translates 'be convinced,' which, to be sure, does not differ much from the exact meaning, which is 'admit' or 'acknowledge' the truth of a statement or argument used by another.

There can be no doubt, I think, of the connection of the adjective and the noun, or of the identity of meaning in the two phrases. It may not be amiss, however, to call attention to the fact that the later lexicons treat the stem-vowel of *ðafian*, *ȝepafa*, etc., as short. This removes the difficulty which troubled Sweet; (see note in his edition of the *Cura*).

F. A. BLACKBURN.

University of Chicago.

#### ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF POPULAR LATIN INTO FRENCH *ei*, *oi*.

##### I. PRONUNCIATION.

THE development referred to in the title of this article constitutes one of the most prominent characteristics of the dialect of the Ile-de-France and, at the same time, one of the most puzzling subjects for investigation known to students of Old-French philology. Tentative explanations of the phenomenon have been made in numerous articles, in many paragraphs of historical French grammars and in several dissertations. The object of the present writer is to invite attention to a possible solution that was suggested to him in part in the course of a critical reading of certain passages of a book which, on account of the many practical points of view of its author, is to be recommended to theorizers in the line of Gallic linguistics: I refer to the work of M.

Paul Passy, *Les Changements Phonétiques*.<sup>1</sup>

On pp. 191-195 of this publication M. Passy is discussing the evolution of diphthongs. He there announces as a principle, illustrated by many examples drawn from French and other languages, the following proposition: Of the two elements of a diphthong the first exhibits a tendency to be dissimilated from the second, and at the same time the second manifests a contrary disposition to be assimilated to the first. By applying this formula to the case in hand we may trace the probable succession of steps in the elaboration of *ē* into *oi*. I begin with *ēi* which has developed from *ē* by the seventh century (cf. English *say, make, escape*, pronounced as *sei, meike, esceipe*). In *ēi* by the dissimilation of the first from the second element we get *ēi*, and by the assimilation of the second to the first *ēē*. Now in *ēē* the first element is again dissimilated from the second, leaving *āē*, while the second is assimilated to the first, making *āē*. Again, in *āē* the first element is dissimilated from the second, producing *ōē*. That this latter stage actually occurred and was pronounced as indicated is proved by rhymes. In the thirteenth century the pronunciation *ōē* is attested, later that of *wē*, and still more recently that of *wa*. The change of the diphthong *ōē* from a falling to a rising one, *ōē*, calls for no especial remark, since several counterparts of such a procedure are known in Old French. The *o* of *ōē* becomes *w* by reason of the suggestion of the *w* produced by the action of the lips in forming rounded *o*, and also in obedience to the general tendency in French for the unaccented first part of a diphthong to assume the value of a semi-consonant. Now, we may consider *wa* as either a further growth of *wē* or else as an independent development from *ōē*, existing by the side of but not deriving from, *wē*. To explain how *wē* directly became *wa* we have a suggestion of Schwan that it did so first before *r* (cf. *barre: poirre, Villon*), the *ē* of *wē* thus forming one of a number of cases in which *e* before *r*+consonant descends to *a*.

<sup>1</sup> Paris, 1891. In addition to the aid received from this thesis I take great pleasure in acknowledging that derived from the penetrating observations of two students now attending my lectures on Old-French Phonology at the Johns Hopkins University,—Messrs. E. C. Armstrong and R. H. Griffith.

To make *wa* a separate product of *ōē* we continue the method by which we arrived at *ōē*. For the latter the next stage of development is the assimilation of the second to the first element by which we obtain *ōā*. Here the first element is again dissimilated, becoming *ō*. In *ōā* the second vowel is the more sonorous and consequently the accent is shifted to it, causing *ōā*, which is the pronunciation of many Frenchmen of to day (some of whom carry the process of dissimilation yet farther, saying *uā*) but in the mouths of the majority of speakers *ōā* became *wa*.

The appended scheme will probably exhibit the natural phonetic sequence of the changes already indicated:

<i>u</i>		<i>i</i>
<i>o</i>		<i>e</i>
<i>o</i>		<i>e</i>
	<i>a</i>	

This scheme represents to the eye the different stages through which the *e*-sound has passed in its successive stages of dissimilation. The second development begins at *i*, and following the evolution of *e*, arrives on the scale as far as *a*. As a *résumé*, the development (in pronunciation) of our combination may be indicated as follows: *ēi*>

*ēi*>*ēē*>*āē*>*āē*>*ōē*> { *ōē*>*wē* (>*wa*)  
*ōā*>*ōā*>*ōā*>*wa*.

## II. ORTHOGRAPHY.

How far does the above explanation of the history of the pronunciation of our phenomenon accord with the fact that the orthography of the digraph has changed but once since French has become a written language, that change being the substitution in *ei* of *o* for *e*, *oi*? The general statement holds good that orthography is conservative, that it always lags behind pronunciation, and that therefore in cases where the former does not coincide with the latter this fact offers no barrier to a reasonable phonetic exposition of the transition of a given speech-product. While the acceptance of this principle may aid in accounting for the present retention of *oi*, in which the two letters assuredly offer no suggestion as to the proper phonetic value of the combination, I think, nevertheless, that at a certain period in the construction of the French language the transcription by *oi* did

respond to a feeling for a change in spelling corresponding to a new pronunciation of derivatives of Popular Latin *e*. We may suppose that the stages in our scheme between *ei* and *oe* were compassed in a comparatively brief space of time; when, however, the written *ei* arrived at the pronunciation *oe* the divergence in pronunciation and orthography was so evident that a conscious effort to reconcile the two was made. The result of this attempt was the use in writing of *oi*. The question may naturally arise: Why, in altering the orthography of *ei*, was only the first vowel (*e*) changed (to *o*) and the *i* left? May not the following suggestions account for this? In virtue of its conservative nature, already noticed, orthography when it does change to suit the pronunciation of a given combination often seizes upon the more prominent part of that combination and denotes it, leaving the less marked portion unaltered. Now in the present instance, either because the change (in pronunciation) of the first element *e* (of *ei*) to *o* (of *oe*) was so much greater from a phonetic point of view than that of the second element *i* (of *ei*) to *e* (of *oe*), or because the accent, bearing originally upon the *o*, rendered the enunciation of the unstressed *e* (of *oe*) indistinct, only the *e* (of *ei*) was altered in spelling, the *i* being left intact; hence the result, *oi*.

Although important changes in pronunciation have affected our combination since it has passed the *oe*-stage, the use of *oi* to indicate whatsoever degree of change has never been interfered with (except sporadically by grammarians); *oi* remained in the sixteenth century when the pronunciation was *wɛ*; and we continue to write it notwithstanding our present pronunciation, *wa*, and it was only at a recent date that *ai* was substituted for it in words in which *oi* had had the value of simple *ɛ* (as; *Français*) for three centuries. Such a state of orthography may be partly due to the fact that the French in becoming a fixed literary medium, clung the more tenaciously to traditional script; it may be due partly also to the coincidence that this *oi* < *ɛ* once written, appealed immediately to the eye as belonging to the very numerous class of words in which *oi* was etymological (originating for the most

part in *ɔ*+a palatal and *au*+a palatal, as *miroir*, *joie*); all three of these *oi*'s had the same development in pronunciation, and the etymological foundation for the orthography of the latter two, if it did not help to fashion *oi* to denote the pronunciation of *oe* < *ei*, (supposition by no means impossible), may at least be adduced as favoring the retention of *oi* after the latter had once made its appearance.

L. EMIL MENDER.

Johns Hopkins University.

### FRENCH LITERATURE.

*Athalie* by Racine, with a Biography, Biblical References and Explanatory Notes in English by C. FONTAINE, B.L., L.D., New York: W. R. Jenkins. Boston: C. Shoenhof. 8vo, pp. iii, III. 25 cts.

*Racine's Athalie*, edited with an Introduction, containing a Treatise on Versification, and with Notes by C. A. EGGERT, Ph. D., Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 8vo, pp. xxvi, 130. 30 cts.

THE publication in the same year of two separate editions of Racine's famous tragedy naturally invites of itself a comparison between the two, and at first sight would seem to make the task of the reviewer an easy one. On closer inspection, however, the books before us reveal entirely different conceptions in their respective authors of the object and purpose of their work, and thereby demand another method of analysis from the one suggested by their titles.

Mr. Fontaine has had in mind a text for class translation, and rapid translation at that. Accordingly, after a short sketch of his author and a list of the proper names in the play, with their corresponding English equivalents, and biblical references (in all barely five pages of print), he comes at once to the play itself. On the way, the list of characters is annotated with the names of the actors who took part in the first three representations.

The notes following the text are evidently the result of class room work. They clearly reproduce what the editor's experience has shown him to be necessary to a quick rendering of the original. For they are, with few